



# Department of Planning, Housing, & Community Development

Mayor, Richard C. David  
Director, Dr. Juliet Berling

SUMMARY OF MINUTES CITY OF BINGHAMTON THE COMMISSION ON ARCHITECTURE & URBAN DESIGN	
MEETING DATE: April 7, 2020	LOCATION: Planning Conference Room, City Hall (GoToWebinar)
CALLED TO ORDER: 12:25 PM	RECORDER OF MINUTES: S. McGee

ROLL CALL	
BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: (All via GoToWebinar)	BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>M. Atchie</li><li>J. Darrow (vice-chair)</li><li>P. Klosky</li><li>M. E. Mauro</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>K. Ellsworth</li><li>M. Lombardini</li><li>S. Edwards</li><li></li></ul>
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:	TITLE & DEPARTMENT:
S. McGee	Historic Preservation & Neighborhood Planner
J. Berling	
O. Varughese	Planner, PHCD
W. Buerkle	Information Services, COB

Selection of a Chairman for the Meeting		
MOTION: To appoint M. Atchie as Chairmen Pro-tem		
FIRST: M. E. Mauro	SECOND: P. Klosky	VOTE: PASSED (4-0-0)
AYE(S): All	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): None

BUSINESS ITEMS	
ADDRESS: 6 ½ Sturges St.	CASE NUMBER: 2020-07
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Determination of Historical Significance for Demolition	
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:  Staff presented all findings in the staff report.  J. Darrow mentioned saving money by not demolishing the house.  P. Klosky discussed preserving houses in an underserved neighborhood.  F. Evangelisti spoke about his understanding of the history of the property. He stated that a developer had gutted the interior. He mentioned that the neighborhood was upset that it was going to be auctioned and that somehow Dave Lindsey became aware of it and contacted the County. He mentioned the asbestos testing had been completed. He mentioned the demolition costs were being donated. He that, as a planner, it's hard to look at the place and see it go and that everything staff has said was accurate. He said that everything on the exterior of the	

house appeared original but for the porch. He said that he didn't see a way to reoccupy the house without angering the residents.

J. Darrow asked how many residents in the neighborhood were present when the tragedy occurred.

F. Evangelisti said he did not know.

Staff asked if there was any record of public input in regard to the project.

F. Evangelisti said he was getting some emails regarding the status of the building.

P. Klosky asked if the emails were reflective of the entire neighborhood's sentiment. He mentioned being concerned about a vocal minority. He also mentioned that it's possible to transform tragedy through rebirth.

Staff mentioned 4 Sturges St. and that application. Staff mentioned not seeing record of a fire occurring there. Staff also reviewed the occupancy of the building. Neighborhood conditions were discussed. Staff asked if an attempt at selling the property to a property owner with a concrete plan to rehabilitate it.

F. Evangelisti stated the County stepped in to acquire the property to demolish it due to what had occurred there. The previous owner was in the process of gutting it presumably for rehab.

M. Atchie asked if there was a plan for reuse of the property after demolition.

F. Evangelisti stated it was his belief that it would be used as a memorial.

J. Darrow asked about the existing memorial, her park.

F. Evangelisti said it would remain a park.

J. Darrow asked if she would then have two memorials.

F. Evangelisti said yes.

M. Atchie asked who would maintain the property following the demolition.

F. Evangelisti said it would either be the County or the City, if the City had an interest.

J. Darrow asked if this would be a property suitable for rehabilitation by the First Ward Action Council.

F. Evangelisti stated this application was made in response to neighborhood sentiment.

J. Darrow asked if there was a list of those individuals and if they constituted a majority of the neighborhood.

F. Evangelisti said he had four or five emails and contact with Dave Lindsey.

J. Darrow said the rehabilitation question had not been answered.

F. Evangelisti said he was not making the argument that it was not a viable property.

M. Atchie said the inside of the building had been gutted. He said it's essentially a shell.

J. Darrow said that it was essentially what occurred on Crandall St. He mentioned not having the necessary information.

Staff mentioned the Commission appeared to want more information about the use of the property following demolition and if there had been any attempt to rehabilitate the property. Staff mentioned that this was not a typical application for the Commission. Staff mentioned that the Commission was charged with looking beyond the horrific tragedy that had occurred at the house and consider the merit of the built resource.

M. E. Mauro said she also wanted to know if the County would keep the parcel.

F. Evangelisti said that he was also hearing that the Commission wanted to hear about neighborhood support.

Staff mentioned that the Commission may want neighborhood input and comment, but that the Commission's decision needed to be based on the criteria.

F. Evangelisti stated that he was just mentioning the questions he had heard.

P. Klosky said that he thinks the neighborhood needs to be involved in this and that he knows people who live in the area but has not heard them express a widespread notion of tearing the home down. He said he understood wanting to erase a painful memory. He mentioned wanting to know more about the fire. He asked if it had been a botched arson. He wanted to know if the community wanted to exorcise itself of the tragedy. He said demolition may be appropriate in that case.

J. Darrow said the house appeared to have been viable in the 80s and 90s.

F. Evangelisti said that the County didn't take this property for back taxes. The County stepped in and bought the property in response to community activism.

J. Darrow said the Commission didn't know if the activists were representative of a majority.

F. Evangelisti said he was not expecting this line of inquiry. He said if neighborhood concerns were important then he would make an effort to document the neighborhood concerns and provide it to the Commission.

J. Darrow made a motion.

Staff mentioned working with Frank and reaching out to the Commission again after the meeting so as to ensure that the County specifically had the information it needed to provide.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Frank Evangelisti, Planning Director, Broome County speaking on behalf of the application.
- No letters received.

**VOTING**

**MOTION: To table the application until more information is provided to the Commission.**

<b>FIRST: J. Darrow</b>	<b>SECOND: M. E. Mauro</b>	<b>VOTE: PASSED (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>

**BUSINESS ITEMS**

<b>ADDRESS: 47 Robinson Street</b>	<b>CASE NUMBER: 2020-06</b>
<b>DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA:</b>	

Determination of Historical Significance for Demolition		
<b>DISCUSSION POINTS &amp; THOSE SPEAKING:</b>		
Staff provided an overview of the application.		
J. Nejeschleba said that both the Land Bank and the County had approved of the sale of the property for demolition purposes.		
She mentioned the Attorney General’s Office had not approved of the demolition with regard to Land Bank funding. She said the Land Bank was seeking local approvals first.		
<b>PUBLIC COMMENT:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Jessica Nejeschleba, Director, Broome County Land Bank Corporation speaking on behalf of the application.</li><li>No letters received.</li></ul>		
<b>VOTING</b>		
<b>MOTION: To issue a Determination of No Historical Significance.</b>		
<b>FIRST: M. Atchie</b>	<b>SECOND: J. Darrow</b>	<b>VOTE: PASSED (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>
<b>SEQR DETERMINATIONS</b>		
<b>ADDRESS: 47 Robinson Street</b>	<b>CASE NUMBER: 2020-06</b>	
<b>DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Determination of Historical Significance for Demolition</b>		
<b>DISCUSSION POINTS:</b> See above.		
<b>VOTING</b>		
<b>MOTION: Motion to declare CAUD as Lead Agency for historic review purposes.</b>		
<b>FIRST: M. E. Mauro</b>	<b>SECOND: J. Darrow</b>	<b>VOTE: PASSED (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>
<b>MOTION: Motion to declare the action as an Unlisted Action.</b>		
<b>FIRST: M. Atchie</b>	<b>SECOND: M. E. Mauro</b>	<b>VOTE: PASSED (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>
<b>MOTION: The Commission then reviewed all relevant SEQR criteria and found no or small impact for each. Motion to issue a Negative Declaration for 47 Robinson Street. Voice vote, no on all criteria.</b>		
<b>FIRST: J. Darrow</b>	<b>SECOND: M. E. Mauro</b>	<b>VOTE: PASSED (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>
<b>BUSINESS ITEMS</b>		
<b>ADDRESS: 55 Park Terrace Place</b>	<b>CASE NUMBER: 2020-05</b>	
<b>DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA:</b>		
Determination of Historical Significance for Demolition		
<b>DISCUSSION POINTS &amp; THOSE SPEAKING:</b>		

<p>Staff provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>J. Nejeschleba mentioned that the plan for both properties following demolition was side lot sales. She said the Mayor's Office had expressed interest in taking ownership of the properties if side lot sale was not possible.</p> <p>Staff asked the Commission if that changed anything about how the Commission had viewed the previous application.</p> <p>The Commission expressed that it did not.</p> <p>J. Nejeschleba thanked the Commission for their continued support.</p>		
<p><b>PUBLIC COMMENT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Jessica Nejeschleba, Director, Broome County Land Bank Corporation, speaking on behalf of the application.</li> <li>▪ No letters received.</li> </ul>		
<b>VOTING</b>		
<b>MOTION: Determination of Historical Significance for Demolition</b>		
<b>FIRST: J. Darrow</b>	<b>SECOND: M. Atchie</b>	<b>VOTE: PASSED (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>
<b>SEQR DETERMINATIONS</b>		
<b>ADDRESS: 55 Park Terrace Place</b>		<b>CASE NUMBER: 2020-05</b>
<b>DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Determination of Historical Significance for Demolition</b>		
<b>DISCUSSION POINTS:</b> See above.		
<b>VOTING</b>		
<b>MOTION: Motion to declare CAUD as Lead Agency for historic review purposes.</b>		
<b>FIRST: J. Darrow</b>	<b>SECOND: M. E. Mauro</b>	<b>VOTE: PASSED (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S):</b>	<b>NAY(S):</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S):</b>
<b>MOTION: Motion to declare the action as an Unlisted Action.</b>		
<b>FIRST: J. Darrow</b>	<b>SECOND: M. E. Mauro</b>	<b>VOTE: PASSED (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>
<b>MOTION: The Commission then reviewed all relevant SEQR criteria and found no or small impact for each. Motion to issue a Negative Declaration for 55 Park Terrace Place. Voice vote, no on all criteria.</b>		
<b>FIRST: J. Darrow</b>	<b>SECOND: M. E. Mauro</b>	<b>VOTE: PASSED (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>
<b>BUSINESS ITEMS</b>		
<b>ADDRESS: Washington Street Mall Design Project</b>		<b>CASE NUMBER: 2020-04</b>
<b>DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA:</b> Certificate of Appropriateness		
<b>DISCUSSION POINTS &amp; THOSE SPEAKING:</b>		

D. Gerber provided a review of the application and the changes that had been made.  
He asked if Jared was on the call.

Staff said he was not.

He explained the changes to the budget and the impact that that had on the design.

He mentioned the removal of the vaulted concrete areas and light poles, but indicated other concrete areas would remain. He mentioned coordinating with the City Engineering Department in regard to drainage on the site and that the plan was to use the existing drainage and utilities.

He asked if there were any questions about demolition.

J. Darrow asked if written permission had been given by the vault owners to access their property.

D. Gerber said he would follow-up on that with the Mayor's Office.

J. Darrow said ok.

D. Gerber spoke about the construction plan for the site.

He mentioned the removal of the resin as presented in the previous plan. He spoke about the new lighting and planting placement. He also spoke about the location of the porcelain pavers. He mentioned the placement of the trash receptacles and the bike rack. He stated that the stage would be removed.

D. Gerber then detailed the porcelain pavers and using them to depict the Susquehanna and Chenango Rivers.

J. Darrow asked if there was any representation of the Chenango Canal.

D. Gerber said no.

M. E. Mauro asked how large the trees were.

D. Gerber said the intent was to have shade in that location.

J. Darrow asked about the species of trees.

D. Gerber said he would get to that shortly.

D. Gerber spoke about the light poles. He stated that the color of the poles would match the color of those along Court Street. He mentioned what the up lighting would look like. He then showed examples of the porcelain pavers. One will be bluestone in color and the other will be tan.

He then showed examples of the proposed benches, trash receptacles, and the bicycle rack.

P. Klosky asked if the trash receptacles were to include an option for recycling.

S. Brietzka said the intention would be to include that.

D. Gerber said they could include two separate receptacles side by side if necessary.

Staff asked if they could provide a specification sheet for the proposed trash receptacles.

D. Gerber said they could provide that information.

M. E. Mauro asked if the light pole would appear as it did in the imagery.

D. Gerber said it would but that it would be black in color.

M. E. Mauro said that it did not appear consistent with the poles downtown.

Staff mentioned including a bar across the benches.

J. Darrow asked if the bicycle racks would feature creative designs.

D. Gerber said that the bicycle racks would be standardized. He explained the design was chosen so that it could secure more bikes. He said they could explore the playful bike racks as an option.

D. Gerber asked if they were custom made.

Staff said they were and that the Office of Economic Development would have that information.

Staff said that the uniformity of the bike racks seemed appropriate in the space.

P. Klosky said the using the creative design seemed out of place in this location.

D. Gerber agreed and said that selecting a particular design that worked in the space could be challenging.

P. Klosky said he thought some commonalities among the features would be appropriate.

J. Darrow said that it appeared as if most members favored the proposed design.

P. Klosky said he was also concerned by the light poles proposed. He asked if an illumination plan could be provided.

S. Breitzka said they would reach out to the manufacturer.

M. Atchie asked if P. Klosky was concerned about the function or the lighting itself.

P. Klosky said he was concerned about the function of the light.

P. Klosky asked about the height of the benches and the ADA.

D. Gerber said they would look into that to ensure ADA requirements were met.

He then spoke about the tree species selection.

J. Darrow asked if they were native species.

D. Gerber said no.

M. Atchie asked if any of the trees had flowers or bloomed.

D. Gerber said no.

He then spoke about the shrub plantings and grasses.

J. Darrow asked if they were indigenous.

D. Gerber said he believed it was a mix.

S. Breitzka said it was a mix.

J. Darrow asked about maintenance.

S. Breitzka said it would fall on the Parks Department.

Staff mentioned that the final selections should go to the Shade Tree Commission.

S. Breitzka said that would be fine.

D. Gerber asked if there were any other questions.

Staff asked if there were any other comments about the site plan.

J. Darrow said he was concerned as he did not have a site plan before him.

M. Atchie said he thought the project was moving in the right direction.

Staff said it seemed like a final decision could be made at the next meeting.

Staff thanked the applicant.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Steve Breitzka and Doug Gerber, Environmental Design & Research, speaking on behalf of the application.
- No letters received.

**VOTING**

**MOTION: To table the application until the May regular meeting.**

**FIRST: J. Darrow**

**SECOND: P. Klosky**

**VOTE: PASSED (4-0-0)**

**AYE(S): All**

**NAY(S): None**

**ABSTENTION(S): None**

P. Klosky left the meeting at 2:13 PM. As such, quorum was lost.

**OTHER BUSINESS ITEMS**

**ADDRESS: 79 Collier Street**

**CASE NUMBER: N/A**

**DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA:**

Other Business Item

**DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:**



Jeff Smith introduced the project to the Commission. He expressed that the owner was eager to get the project going.

He spoke about the Collier Street Lobby and Council Chambers. He spoke about the floor and plasterwork in the Council Chambers. He spoke about the public easement and the mayor's portraits.

J. Smith then spoke about the necessary exterior and roof work. He mentioned retaining the historic materials and the minor repair work needed. He spoke about the additional investigation that the cupola requires.

He then detailed the proposed scope of work on the rear of the building. He spoke about the alterations to the windows and the vestibule area. He mentioned the areas that would be retained. He spoke about peeling paint and the lack of insulation. He said the applicant was proposing a stucco like finish. He also mentioned proposing a portico in place of the vestibule.

Staff asked about the cresting over the portico.

J. Smith provided a more detailed explanation.

Staff mentioned the Planning Commission's request to CAUD for input regarding the historic interior spaces.

J. Smith said that the property owner was aware. He mentioned that some of the work could be completed

M. Atchie mentioned some of that work being classified as maintenance.

J. Smith that said that sounded correct.

Staff mentioned that since there was no quorum it would probably make more sense for the Commissioner's to provide individual feedback.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Jeff Smith, Chianis & Anderson Architects, PLLC, speaking on behalf of the proposal.
- No letters received.

**VOTING**

**MOTION: N/A**

**FIRST: N/A**

**SECOND: N/A**

**VOTE: N/A**

**AYE(S): N/A**

**NAY(S): N/A**

**ABSTENTION(S): N/A**

**OTHER BUSINESS ITEMS**

**ADDRESS: 41 Court Street**

**CASE NUMBER: N/A**

**DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA:**

Other Business Item

Staff provided an introduction to the application in regard to the interior and exterior alterations to the property.

M. Atchie asked how many bedrooms were proposed for the project.

Staff said 41 bedrooms in total.

M. E. Mauro asked about the mention of the prior meeting.		
Staff provided further detail		
J. Darrow asked about development moving forward.		
Staff provided clarification.		
Staff then mentioned obtaining SHPO input in regard to the interior alterations.		
M. Atchie asked if there was a timeline for the project approvals.		
Staff said that the applicant likely sought approval as soon as possible.		
M. Atchie mentioned that since there was no quorum that the Commission would likely have more time to provide input.		
Staff asked that the Commission provide individual comments, if possible, since there was no quorum.		
Staff asked if having SHPO's opinion would be helpful.		
The Commission members present indicated it would be.		
<b>PUBLIC COMMENT:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No one present to speak about the proposal.</li> <li>▪ No letters received.</li> </ul>		
<b>VOTING</b>		
<b>MOTION: N/A</b>		
<b>FIRST: N/A</b>	<b>SECOND: N/A</b>	<b>VOTE: N/A</b>
<b>AYE(S): N/A</b>	<b>NAY(S): N/A</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): N/A</b>

OTHER BUSINESS ITEMS		
<b>ADDRESS: Historic Pain Colors</b>		<b>CASE NUMBER: N/A</b>
<b>DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA:</b>		
Other Business Item		
Since no quorum of commissioners was present, the Commission did not discuss the historic paint colors collection.		
<b>PUBLIC COMMENT:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No comments.</li> <li>▪ No letters received.</li> </ul>		
<b>VOTING</b>		
<b>MOTION: N/A</b>		
<b>FIRST: N/A</b>	<b>SECOND: N/A</b>	<b>VOTE: N/A</b>
<b>AYE(S): N/A</b>	<b>NAY(S): N/A</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): N/A</b>

OTHER BUSINESS ITEMS
----------------------

<b>ADDRESS: Small Cell Design Standards review</b>		<b>CASE NUMBER: N/A</b>
<b>DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA:</b>		
Other Business Item		
Staff asked that the Commission review the Small Cell Wireless Standards that Syracuse utilizes for the May regular meeting.		
<b>PUBLIC COMMENT:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No comments.</li> <li>▪ No letters received.</li> </ul>		
<b>VOTING</b>		
<b>MOTION: N/A</b>		
<b>FIRST: N/A</b>	<b>SECOND: N/A</b>	<b>VOTE: N/A</b>
<b>AYE(S): N/A</b>	<b>NAY(S): N/A</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): N/A</b>

<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>		
<b>A MOTION TO ADJOURN COULD NOT BE MADE AS NO QUORUM OF COMMISSIONERS WAS PRESENT.</b>		<b>TIME: 2:55pm</b>
<b>FIRST: N/A</b>	<b>SECOND: N/A</b>	<b>VOTE: N/A</b>
<b>AYE(S): N/A</b>	<b>NAY(S):</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S):</b>